

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

JANE DOE (A.K.A. "A.T."))	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No.: 4:25-cv-193-JSD
)	
CITY OF FLORISSANT, MISSOURI)	(Consolidated with 4:24-cv-01445, 4:24-cv-
)	01528, 4:24-cv-01571; 4:24-cv-01412-JSD)
and)	
)	
JULIAN ALCALA,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Plaintiff Jane Doe (a.k.a. A.T.) has filed a Consent [Motion] to Stay for Purposes of Discovery ("Motion to Stay"; ECF No. 20). For the reasons stated herein, the Court grants the Motion to Stay.

BACKGROUND

The respective plaintiffs in the consolidated cases¹ (referred to collectively as "Plaintiffs") have sued the City of Florissant, Missouri ("City"), and former police officer Julian Alcala ("Mr. Alcala"). The allegations are that Mr. Alcala, at different times in early and mid-2024, conducted vehicle traffic stops of Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs have each essentially alleged that Mr. Alcala took their cell phones and either transmitted an explicit video from a cell phone to his cell phone, or took

¹ The plaintiffs in 4:24-cv-01412-JSD are S.L.D., T.A.M., G.E.S., N.R.T., R.A.T., and K.J.T.
The plaintiffs in 4:24-cv-01445-JSD are Jane Doe 2, Jane Doe 3, Jane Doe 4, Jane Doe 5, Jane Doe 6, and John Doe 2.
The plaintiff in 4:24-cv-01528-JSD is Jane Doe.
The plaintiff in 4:24-cv-01571-JSD is Julie Doe.

photographs on his cell phone of explicit photographs on the respective Plaintiffs' phones. Plaintiffs allege that they have been harmed by this conduct under various theories of law. Plaintiffs purport to raise allegations against City under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and *Monell*,² pertaining to Mr. Alcala's alleged conduct.

Notably, on November 13, 2024, a Grand Jury charged Mr. Alcala by Indictment with violation of 18 U.S.C. §1519 in Count One and violations of 18 U.S.C. §242 in Counts Two through Twenty-One. *See* Cause No. 4:24-CR-594-HEA-SRW (hereinafter, "Criminal Action"). This case remains pending in the United States District Court, Eastern District of Missouri.

On December 23, 2024, Defendant City of Florissant, Missouri filed an unopposed Motion to Stay in the Lead Case. (Case No. 4:24-cv-01412-JSD; ECF No. 24) On January 13, 2025, the Court held a hearing on the Motion to Stay, where all counsel confirmed that the Motion to Stay was unopposed. On January 13, 2025, this Court granted the Motion to Stay Proceedings for Discovery Purposes. (Case No. 4:24-cv-01412-JSD; ECF No. 28) For the reasons stated in the Court's prior order granting the Motion to Stay, the Court grants Plaintiff A.T.'s Consent [Motion] to Stay for Purposes of Discovery (ECF No. 20).

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff A.T.'s Consent [Motion] to Stay for Purposes of Discovery (ECF No. 20) is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this case is hereby **STAYED** and **ADMINISTRATIVELY CLOSED** pending the disposition of the Criminal Action (Cause No. 4:24-cr-594).

² *Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs. of City of New York*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that counsel for Mr. Alcala shall continue to file Status Reports in the lead case, Case No. 4:24-cv-01412-JSD, every sixty days, as well as upon completion of the Criminal Action (whichever occurs first), to update the Court and the other parties regarding the criminal proceedings.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants shall respond to the respective complaints within twenty-one days from the date the Stay Order is lifted.

Dated this 16th day of June, 2025.



JOSEPH S. DUEKER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE